UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALBERT KIRK JONES, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-04571-JLS (SK)

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION TO (1)
GRANT IN PART DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT; (2) DENY
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY
JUDGMENT; AND (3) DISMISS
PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL
STATE-LAW CLAIMS WITHOUT
PREJUDICE

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the attached Report and Recommendation to grant in part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, deny Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and dismiss Plaintiffs' state-law claims without prejudice (ECF 123), Plaintiffs' Objections to the Report and Recommendation (ECF 124), and any pertinent records as needed.

Having reviewed de novo those specific portions of the Report and Recommendation to which Plaintiffs have timely and properly objected, the Court concludes that nothing in the Objections affects or alters the material findings and conclusions set forth in the Report and Recommendation. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). If nothing else, Plaintiffs have neither properly and timely alleged a claim for municipal liability against the City of Los Angeles, nor have they produced any evidence sufficient to create a genuine dispute about whether the City has a municipal policy, practice, or custom that was the cause of Plaintiffs' alleged constitutional injuries under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Monell v. New York City Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694–95 (1978); *Dougherty v. City of Covina*, 654 F.3d 892, 900 (9th Cir. 2011).

The Court therefore accepts the material findings and conclusions in the Report and Recommendation and adopts the recommendation. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Judgment will be entered accordingly consistent with that recommendation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>August 20, 2025</u>

JOSEPHINE L. STATON United States District Judge